



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/821,267 | 03/29/2001 | Kazutoyo Maehiro | 6514-8 | 4470 |

7055 7590 05/27/2005

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2152

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,267

Applicant(s)

MAEHIRO ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/24/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

OFFICE ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 01/14/2005.
2. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination. In amendment A, filed on 01/14/2005.
2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.
3. Applicant is required to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification. The status of all citations of US filed applications in the specification should also be updated where appropriate.
4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
pg 7, line 3, it is not clear whether the 2nd should be changed to "1st", i.e. is the device trying to send to itself or to another entity? Appropriate correction/explanation is required.

Applicant's remarks filed 01/14/2005 have been considered but are found moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

Art Unit: 2152

- i. the identifier- claim 1, line 27.
- b. The claim language in the following claims is murky or not clearly understood:
 - i. As per claim 8, line 4, it is not clearly understood what is meant by “apparatus the 2nd information processing apparatus”(i.e. does the Applicant mean apparatus to the 2nd?).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 1, 4-5, 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adler et al. (hereinafter Adler), US 6,249,765.

7. As per claim 1, Adler teaches an information processing apparatus capable of sending a message about a schedule to a 2nd information processing apparatus (Col. 8, lines 35-37, database 310) through a communications network, wherein the 2nd information processing apparatus is capable of analyzing the message being received and extracting words or phrases (Col. 8, lines 30-37) for entering into the schedule managed by a scheduler (Col. 8, lines 55-65):

a first storage device that stores a group of first data sets in which the words or phrases are matched to respective identifiers (Col. 7, lines 50-61, wherein the first storage device would be item 238, identifiers are the keywords in digitized format), while a second storage device in the 2nd information processing apparatus (Col. 8, lines 35-37, item 310 the database) stores a group of second data sets corresponding to

Art Unit: 2152

words or phrases having the same meanings as the words or phrases corresponding to the respective identifiers of the first data sets (Col. 8, lines 55-65, wherein the identifiers are keywords, the extracted key words are a subset of the original keyword document);

a word or phrase selector that selects at least one word or phrase from the words or phrases stored in the first storage device (Col. 8, lines 55-60);

an extractor that extracts a specific identifier corresponding to the selected word or phrase from the first data sets (Col. 10, lines 44-50); and

a transmitter that transmits the extracted identifier as the message to the 2nd information processing apparatus (Col. 8, lines 30-37, wherein the extracted information are sent to database 310 and stored there).,

wherein the identifier transmitted from the information processing apparatus is converted to a specific word or phrase on the basis of the second data sets stored in the second storage device (Col. 8, lines 55-60; Col. 10, lines 44-53, wherein the original document is 'converted' or filtered so that only portion of the original document of interested will be extracted to the database 310 and used by the scheduler, i.e. the date, time etc.).

8. As per claim 2, Adler teaches the information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein the words or phrases stored in the first storage device are represented by a first language, while the words or phrases stored in the second storage device are represented by a second language different from the first language (Col. 7, lines 55-60, wherein there is a language translation so that machines can understand).

9. As per claim 3, Adler teaches the information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 2, wherein the words or phrases of the first and the second storage devices are grouped into different categories and then stored in the first and the second storage devices, respectively (Col. 7, lines 55-60,

Art Unit: 2152

wherein the incoming speech is grouped into text, and handwriting is grouped into text, this would read on the first storage device, i.e. different categories of text; next 2nd storage, i.e. the database 310 stores categories of extracted information, i.e. date, time, phone number and store them within itself, see Col. 8, lines 30-36, lines 57-64; Col. 10, lines 43-50).

10. As per claim 4, Adler teaches the information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein the words or phrases of the first and the second storage devices are grouped into different categories and then stored in the first and the second storage devices, respectively (Col. 7, lines 55-60, wherein the incoming speech is grouped into text, and handwriting is grouped into text, this would read on the first storage device, i.e. different categories of text; next 2nd storage, i.e. the database 310 stores categories of extracted information, i.e. date, time, phone number and store them within itself, see Col. 8, lines 30-36, lines 57-64; Col. 10, lines 43-50).

11. As per claim 5, Adler teaches an information processing apparatus capable of receiving a message about a schedule from a second information processing apparatus through a communications network, analyzing the message being received, and extracting words or phrases for entering into the schedule managed by a scheduler, comprising (see claim 1 above, note now that 2nd device is the client device and the first device is now the database 310):

a first storage device that stores a group of first data sets in which the words or phrases are matched to respective identifiers, while a second storage device in the 2nd information processing apparatus stores a group of second data sets corresponding to words or phrases having the same meanings as the words or phrases corresponding to the respective identifiers of the first data sets (see claim 1 above);

a converter that converts the message in the form of the identifiers transmitted from the 2nd information processing apparatus to the words or phrases on the basis of the first data sets stored in the first storage device (see claim 1 above); and

Art Unit: 2152

an entry system that enters the words or phrases converted by the converter into the schedule (Col. 8, lines 30-36, lines 55-65).

12. As per claim 6, claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 2 above.

13. As per claim 7, claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 3 above.

14. As per claim 8, Adler teaches the information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 7, further comprising:

a returning system that returns the message received from the 2nd information processing apparatus to the 2nd information processing apparatus when the words or phrases are entered into the scheduler by the entry system (Col. 12, lines 60 – Col. 13, lines 5).

15. As per claim 9, Adler teaches the information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 6, further comprising:

a returning system that returns the message received from the 2nd information processing apparatus to the 2nd information processing apparatus when the words or phrases are entered into the scheduler by the entry system (Col. 12, lines 60 – Col. 13, lines 5).

16. As per claim 10, claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 3 above.

11. As per claims 11, Adler teaches the information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 10, further comprising:

a returning system that returns the message received from the 2nd information processing apparatus to the 2nd information processing apparatus when the words or phrases are entered in the scheduler by the entry system (Col. 12, lines 60 – Col. 13, lines 5).

12. As per claim 12, claims 12 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 11 above.

Art Unit: 2152

13. As per claims 13-18, claims 13-18 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1 above.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Information Processing System, Method For Message Communications Recording Medium And Computer Program".

- | | | |
|------|------------|------------------|
| i. | US 6615258 | Barry et al. |
| ii. | US 6201536 | Hendricks et al. |
| iii. | US 5592656 | Canzone |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BURGESS, GLENTON B can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
3/29/01

Application/Control Number: 09/821,267

Page 8

Art Unit: 2152

CZ

May 18, 2005.